



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,005	11/14/2003	Dietmar Spanke		7817
23364	7590	02/27/2009	EXAMINER	
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 625 SLATERS LANE FOURTH FLOOR ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-1176			ALSOMIRI, ISAM A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3662		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		02/27/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte DIETMAR SPANKE

Application No. 10/712,005
Technology Center 3662

Mailed: February 27, 2009

Before DELORES LOWE, *Review Team Paralegal*
LOWE, *Review Team Paralegal*.

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on February 5, 2009. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matters requiring attention prior to docketing.

EXAMINER'S ANSWER
 GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A review of the file finds that the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal of the claims as provided in the Examiner's Answer mailed October 30, 2008 under the heading "Grounds of rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal" is either unclear or is not consistent with the grounds of rejection of claims set forth in the last Office action of record. The grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal as provided in the Examiner's Answer must be consistent with the last Office action of record, **including any Advisory action responsive to any after final submissions**. Furthermore, the examiner must provide a clear statement of whether examiner agrees or disagrees with the statement of grounds of rejection to be reviewed as set forth in the brief and an explanation of any disagreement. *See also Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 1207.02 (8th ed. Rev. 6, Sept 2007)* for details.

A review of the Examiner's Answer finds that it is unclear what rejected claims are on appeal as compared to the Appeal Brief and/or the Examiner's Answer does not clearly address differences between rejections set forth in the Examiner's Answer and those addressed in the brief.

Clarification of the record is required for all Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal for all claims.

EXAMINER'S CONSIDERATION OF REPLY BRIEF

A Reply Brief was filed in this application on December 30, 2008. There is no evidence on the record indicating that the Examiner has considered the Reply Brief in accordance with 37 CFR CFR § 41.43(a)(1) and MPEP § 1208, part II.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the application be returned to the Examiner:

- 1) to vacate the Examiner's Answer mailed October 30, 2008;
- 2) to generate a new Examiner's Answer setting forth the correct Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal and to correct other sections of the Answer as may be required;
- 3) and to include the approval of the TC Director or his/her designee (as required for any new grounds of rejection);
- 4) consider the Reply Brief filed December 30, 2008 as indicated above; and

5) such further action as may be required.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

DAL\

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 SLATERS LANE
FOURTH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA VA 22314-1176